DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 055 992 24 SP 005 356

TITLE Improving Research Capabilities of Large City School Systems. Final Report.

INSTITUTION Council of the Great City Schools, Washington, D.C.

SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.

BUREAU NO BR-9-0495

PUB DATE Dec 70

GRANT OEG-0-9-203495-4432(010)

NOTE 67p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29

DESCRIPTORS Affective Objectives; *Educational Researchers; Evaluation Techniques; Instructional Systems; Measurement Techniques; *Professional Training; Program Evaluation; *School Personnel; Systems Analysis; *Urban Schools

ABSTRACT

Between November 1969 and September 1970, four training sessions were held--two for research directors from the 21 school districts comprising the Council of the Great City Schools, and two for members of research and evaluation staffs. The first research directors session dealt with information systems and evaluation of multiple project programs; the second was concerned with systems approaches to the solution of educational problems. The first session for research and evaluation staff was concerned with measurement problems in the affective domain. In the second staff session, a different approach was followed. Under contract, the Teaching Research Division of the Oregon State System of Higher Education offered individualized instruction in four areas: proposal writing, instructional systems, measurement, and evaluation. In addition, there were two meetings of superintendents, assistant superintendents, and board members of the 21 participating school systems. At both gatherings, emphasis was placed on research and evaluation as a means to improve decision making. Participants' comments on the program were highly favorable. (Appendixes contain lists of participants and agendas for each session and samples of participants' reactions.) (RT)

BR9-0495
PA 24
SP

ED055992

FINAL REPORT

Project No. 9-0495
Grant No. OGE-0-9-203495-4432 (010)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEH REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

IMPROVING RESEARCH CAPABILITIES OF LARGE CITY SCHOOL SYSTEMS

The Council of the Great City Schools
1819 'H' Street, N.W. Suite 850
Washington, D.C. 20006

December 1970

Submitted to:
Office of Education
U.S. Department of
Health, Education and Welfare

SP005356

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements i

Summary 1

Introduction 3

Objectives 5

Program Procedures 6

Results 11

Appendices 13

Appendix A 14

Appendix B 15

Appendix C 18

Appendix D 24

Appendix E 33

Appendix F 54

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The report presented herein represents the efforts of several individuals and organizations.

The Council of the Great City Schools extends its appreciation to the United States Office of Education's Bureau of Research, which funded the project. Especially helpful were Richard Harbeck, John Egermeier, and George Carnett.

The Council is also grateful to the staff committees, research directors, and other research and evaluation personnel from the Great Cities as well as the superintendents who permitted their release time to work on the project.

Finally, The Council wishes to thank the consultants and subcontractors who entered enthusiastically into the project and its purposes and whose excellent contributions contributed so much to the final success of the effort.

SUMMARY

The project, "Improving Research Capabilities of Large City School Systems," was conducted by The Council of the Great City Schools as one of a series of activities designed to strengthen the research and evaluation divisions within its member districts.

The project was designed as a set of four training sessions. Two of these were for research directors from the 21 school districts comprising the Council, and two were for members of research and evaluation staffs. Generally, the sessions for research directors were intended to increase knowledge in broad and rapidly developing areas within the research and evaluation field; the purpose, in other words, was not to develop specific skills but to provide the basis for longer-range decisions aimed at improving research and evaluation services. The sessions for staff members, on the other hand, were narrow and intensive and were designed for the development of specific skills.

One research directors session was held in Washington, D.C., in November of 1969 and dealt with information systems and with evaluation of multiple project programs. The second research director's session, held in Vail, Colorado, in May, 1970, was concerned with systems approaches to the solutions of educational problems.

The first session for research and evaluation staff was in Memphis, Tennessee, in February, 1970, and was concerned with measurement problems in the affective domain. In the second staff session, held in Monmouth, Oregon, during September of 1970, a different approach was followed. Under contract, the Teaching Research Division of the Oregon State System of Higher Education offered individualized instruction in four areas: proposal

writing, instructional systems, measurement, and evaluation.

All indications are that the program was highly successful and that research and evaluation capabilities in large city school systems were indeed improved through it.

INTRODUCTION

The research and evaluation capabilities of large city public school systems have taken on a greatly increased importance in recent years. On a local level, school systems need valid information for improvement of educational programs and for facilitation of decision making. On a national level, the effects of federal expenditures on strengthening achievement of youth require systematic evaluation to justify allocation of resources. The possibility of meeting both local and national needs for valid information cannot be attained unless steps are taken to strengthen the operational capabilities of research and evaluation divisions in large city school systems.

As recently as five years ago, the major responsibilities of Bureaus of Educational Research in public school systems were characterized by testing programs and administrative data gathering. Increasingly, however, the direction of research and development activities has turned. The magnitude of social problems and criticism of public schools has resulted in a redirection of efforts to include greater involvement in evaluation and experimental research related to current problems facing education. Additional impetus has been provided by ESEA Title I requirements for systematic evaluation of projects. The consequence of these events is that public school research organizations have needed more adequately trained personnel to design, implement, and disseminate useful evaluative studies.

The competence of public school research organizations has implications beyond the operational effectiveness of any single school system. National consequences have been born. The efforts to improve education for

culturally disadvantaged children are directly related today to the competence of school research personnel to assess strengths and weaknesses of programs initiated with ESEA funds. Valid feedback of information is a critical element for local program development. Equally important, such feedback can enable state and federal agencies to assess the impact of dollar expenditure on the improvement of public education.

The Council of the Great City Schools, in initiating and implementing the project "Improving Research Capabilities of Large City School Systems," completed the first stage of a systematic program to upgrade research competence in twenty-one of the largest city school systems in the country.

Directors of Research were involved in two three-day training seminars. The first of these dealt with evaluation as an information system for project development in addition to evaluation of multiple project programs. The second of the seminars examined systems analysis as an approach to problem solving in education.

Staff members within research departments of the Great Cities school systems participated in two concentrated training workshops. One of these sessions was directed at measurement in the affective domain. The other session consisted of individualized instruction in four areas:
1) Proposal writing, 2) Instructional systems, 3) Measurement, and 4) Evaluation.

In addition, there were two meetings of the Superintendents, Assistant Superintendents, and board members of the twenty-one participating large city school systems. At both gatherings, emphasis was placed on research and evaluation as a means to improve decision making.

These sessions will be described in greater detail in the sections which follow.

OBJECTIVES

The following objectives guided program planning, implementation, and evaluation:

a. To improve the quality of program evaluation in large city public school systems.

b. To develop a means for continually upgrading public school research personnel in gathering, analyzing, and reporting evaluative data.

c. To improve communications between research personnel in public school systems, universities, and the U.S. Office of Education in relation to evaluation problems.

PROGRAM PROCEDURES

"Improving Research Capabilities of Large City School Systems" called for implementation of a research training program in which the Council of the Great City Schools, in consultation with Office of Education Personnel and individual consultants, engaged in training activities leading to increased competence on the part of public school research personnel. This was achieved by updating and expanding the knowledge and capabilities of experienced personnel presently employed in the participating districts.

Council staff, its Research Steering Committee, consisting of research directors from member cities, and outside consultants, worked together in planning for and conducting the actual training program. The training activities themselves consisted of seminars, workshops, and individualized instruction.

There were four operational elements to the project:

1) Orientation sessions for Superintendents, Assistant Superintendents, and school board members.
2) Intensive seminars for research directors of the participating districts.
3) Workshops for research and evaluation staff members.
4) Organization of cooperative inter-school system efforts related to the study of common problems facing urban school systems.

Orientation sessions were designed to provide top level administrators and school board members with the most current information and thought concerning the relationship of research and evaluation to operations of school systems.

Research Director's Sessions.--Seminars for research directors provided for presentations and discussions of new developments related to data collection and analysis as well as approaches to evaluation in field settings.

In November, 1969, the twenty-one urban directors of research met in Washington, D. C. (See Appendix B). The topics of discussion were "Evaluation As an Information System for Project Development" and "Evaluation of Multiple Project Programs". From the U.S. Office of Education, Dr. Karl Hereford, Director of Program Planning of BESE, explained the issues related to evaluation of multiple programs. Dr. Francis A.J. Ianni of Columbia University, Dr. Richard Jaeger of Stanford University, and Dr. Robert Stake of the University of Illinois provided input from the higher level educational institutions. Finally, the Council research directors themselves, as well as representatives from urban school systems which were not members of the Council, contributed practical operational models of evaluation. At the same conference site, the superintendents and board members of the participating twenty-one members of the Council were gathered to discuss the goals and priorities of the Council with respect to research. Dr. James Gallagher of the U.S. Office of Education added governmental information to the program.

In May, 1970, the research directors of the participating cities met in Vail, Colorado to discuss "Systems Viewpoint in Project Development". Dr. Desmond Cook and his associates, Dr. John Skalski and Dr. Gregory Trzebiatowski from Ohio State University, were on hand

to present not only basic systems concepts but also the tools and techniques used by a systems manager. Multi-project management was discussed in addition to single project development and evaluation. From a Council member city, Dallas, Texas, Dr. Rogers Barton provided input on performance contracting. Additional involvement of the research directors themselves occurred in several panel discussions on such topics as: "Implications of Using the Systems Approach for the Research Director" and "What Does Systems Analysis Mean Relative to Program Development and Evaluation" and "Where Do We Go From Here in the School Research Operation?" Indicative of the active interest in the topic of this seminar was the fact that many cities at their own expense sent more than one participant to the meeting.

Staff Member's Sessions.--Research and evaluation staff members attending the training program from the participating school districts reviewed statistical techniques, evaluation models, and data collection instruments. The participating individuals were experienced professionals who possessed knowledge and skill related to research. The purpose of the training program was to upgrade and update these capabilities.

The first workshop for research and evaluation staff was held in February, 1970, in Memphis, Tennessee. In a meeting prior to the workshop the Steering Committee of the research directors had decided that the topic of "Measurement in the Affective Domain" would be valuable to members of their staff. Dr. David Orr laid the groundwork for discussion by giving a historical background and speaking to the theoretical issues in measuring affect. Follow up to this general introduction was provided

by Dr. Marvin Shaw of the University of Florida, Gainesville. Dr. Shaw considered the general nature of attitude formation and change and also gave an overview of available measuring instruments. Particular emphasis was given to various problems identified by the participants themselves and on areas of concern in public education. Dr. Everett Rogers of Michigan State University presented specific attitude measuring methods focusing mainly on the Likert technique and on sociometric analysis. Dr. Bradley Greenberg, also of Michigan State University, addressed the group on the semantic differential and led the members in development of their own scales. After each topic of discussion the large body of participants broke into small groups, with an expert in each group, for individualized instruction and informal attention to specific problems. In addition, in an evening program presentations were given by the research staff on individual experiences within their particular city in developing and using affective instruments. The informal small groups combined with individual presentations created a good rapport and friendly spirit among the participants and between the participants and consultants.

The second workshop for the staff of the research directors was held in Monmouth, Oregon, at the Oregon College of Education, in September, 1970. This session was planned and handled in different manner than the others.

Dr. Jack Edling, of the Teaching-Research Division of the Oregon State System of Higher Education, met with the Council's Research Steering Committee, presented training materials already developed by

Teaching Research, and suggested an individualized training approach which would allow each research director some latitude in determining which skills he would like his staff members to develop. The Steering Committee voted to follow Dr. Edling's suggestion.

At the training session, research and evaluation staff members from Council cities began in one of areas: proposal writing, instructional systems, measurement, and evaluation. Tests were given to determine entry level skills, and instruction was highly individualized by the staff of Teaching Research, working under the direction of Dr. Dale Hamerus and Dr. James Blaird. Participants moved at their own rates, and if they reached proficiency level in their initial area, they were allowed to choose a second area and begin work there.

Some 30 research and evaluation staff members, 21 paid for by the project and the remainder sent at the district's expense, attended the three-day session. Proficiency tests given by Teaching Research confirmed that intended skills were developed and letters from participants to the Council indicated their satisfaction with the program.

As mentioned previously, the Superintendents from the twenty-one member cities of the Council participated in the conference in Washington, D. C., in November, 1969. In addition, a meeting was held among the Superintendents in May, 1970, in Buffalo, New York. Here, too, the Project Director presented information regarding the programs which had already taken place, in an effort not only to keep the superintendents informed on the content of the programs but also to provide a continuing link between the research departments and the decision makers. Suggestions for future programs were also introduced and discussed.

RESULTS

It is difficult to measure directly the fulfillment of the original objectives of the project "Improving Research Capabilities of Large City School Systems." The activities were planned to insure the introduction of new ideas, methods, and techniques into the great city schools and to upgrade their research and administrative capabilities. Further, the design of the project created a unique learning experience by bringing together field authorities and practicing school personnel in a close working, as opposed to lecture, setting.

The inservice training sessions were structured to meet the needs of participants, and the sessions also attempted to consider the practical relevant topics. Before each workshop, a Steering Committee representing twenty-one Research Directors met to plan and discuss the program as well as the consultants to be summoned. The Steering Committee was composed of a member from each of six geographical regions of the nation. Special care was given to promote the needs of each region as well as each city.

As the Appendices to follow indicate, the concensus of participants' opinions toward the effectiveness of the various programs was quite positive in all cases. It is noteworthy that many workshop attendants wrote letters of both constructive criticism and praise. It is also important that, in many cases, participants later professionally contacted associates from other cities in efforts to continue the exchange of information. In fact, most attendees cited that unstructured time was a desirable facet of the seminars because of the opportunity to freely explore the ideas and experiences of representatives from other cities' systems. In all seminars,

therefore, several hours were scheduled informally -- usually during the late afternoon or evening after attendants had worked together for a time.

In the meetings of the Superintendents from the twenty-one cities, there was great support of the project. Clear indication was given that the training activities of the programs were not only beneficial to their staff but also to themselves. Reports of the staff seminars were overwhelmingly approved, and these reports helped to create the agenda for their own discussions. The project provided the groundwork, therefore, for improving the link between the research-evaluation departments and the decision-making administrators.

This project obviously represented just a beginning in the effort to improve management practices in large school districts by bridging the gap between evaluative information and the decision process. A great deal remains to be done, and it must be done quickly because of the severe crisis which urban school systems face. The project was successful, however, in that it did result in improved skills, and, more important perhaps, it focused the attention of major decision makers on the research and evaluation process and on improvements which are needed. It also set a pattern of cooperation among major school districts, the Office of Education, university staff, and other knowledgeable persons in the research and evaluation field. This pattern needs to be followed up quickly in more comprehensive and more intensive efforts.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Board of Directors

The Council of the Great City Schools

CITY	SUPERINTENDENT	BOARD MEMBER
ATLANTA	Dr. John Letson	Dr. Benjamin Mayes
BALTIMORE	Dr. Thomas D. Sheldon	Mr. Robert Karwacki
BOSTON	Dr. William H. Ohrenberger	Mr. Paul R. Tierney
BUFFALO	Dr. Joseph Manch	Dr. George Blackman
CHICAGO	Dr. James F. Redmond	Mrs. Louis A. Malis
CLEVELAND	Dr. Paul W. Briggs	Mr. Daniel O. Corrigan
DALLAS	Dr. Nolan Estes	Dr. Marvin Berkeley
DENVER	Dr. Howard Johnson	Mr. James Perrill
DETROIT	Dr. Norman Drachler	Mr. James Hathaway
LOS ANGELES	Dr. Robert Kelly	Dr. Robert L. Doctor
MEMPHIS	Dr. E. C. Stimbert	Mr. Edgar H. Bailey
MILWAUKEE	Dr. Richard P. Gousha	Mr. Thomas Brennan
MINNEAPOLIS	Dr. John B. Davis	Rev. David W. Preus
NEW YORK CITY	Dr. Harvey B. Scribner	Mr. Murry Bergtraum
PHILADELPHIA	Dr. Mark R. Shedd	Mr. George Hutt
PITTSBURGH	Dr. Louis J. Kishkunas	Dr. Robert J. Kibee
PORTLAND	Dr. Robert W. Blanchard	Mr. Frank Case
ST. LOUIS	Dr. Clyde C. Miller	Mr. Malcolm W. Martin
SAN DIEGO	Dr. Jack P. Hornback	Dr. Gene French
SAN FRANCISCO	Dr. Thomas Shaheen	Mr. Alan H. Nichols
WASHINGTON, D.C.	Dr. Hugh C. Scott	Rev. James Coates

APPENDIX B

Agenda of the Washington, D.C.
Session for Research Directors

Washington, D.C. RESEARCH DIRECTORS

"Evaluation as an Information System
for Project Development"

"Evaluation of Multiple Project Programs"

EVALUATION AS AN INFORMATION SYSTEM
FOR PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

9:00 - 9:30 A.M.	Opening Remarks Introduction of the Executive Vice President	Dr. Joseph L. Mazur Director, Division of Research and Evaluation Cleveland Public Schools
FIRST SESSION:	Dr. Robert Lankton, presiding	
9:30 - 11:00 A.M.	Status of the Discrepancy Evaluation Model	Dr. Malcolm Provus Director of Research Pittsburgh Public Schools
11:00 - 12:30 P.M.	Status of CIPP (Context Input- Process Product Model Evaluation	Dr. Howard Merriman Director of Evaluation and Research Columbus Public Schools
12:30 - 2:00 P.M.	Luncheon - Announcements	
SECOND SESSION:	Dr. John L. Hayman, Jr., presiding	
2:00 - 3:30 P.M.	Description/Judgement Evaluation Model	Dr. Robert Stake Professor of Education University of Illinois
3:30 - 4:00 P.M.	Break	
4:00 - 5:00 P.M.	Panel Discussion of Strengths and Weaknesses Related to Three Concep- tualizations of Evaluation Models	Drs. Provus, Stake, and Merriman
6:00 P.M.	Dinner	

EVALUATION OF MULTIPLE PROJECT PROGRAMS

Thursday, November 13, 1969

THIRD SESSION:	Dr. Samuel McClelland, presiding	
9:00 - 10:30 A.M.	Issues Related to Evaluation of Multiple Programs	Dr. Karl Hereford Director, Program Planning, BESE
10:30 - 12:00 P.M.	Nature of Management Evaluation: Specific Problems Related to the Development of Multi-Project Evaluation Designs	Dr. Philip Kearney Associate Superintendent, Michigan State Department of Education Bureau of Research
12:00 - 1:30 P.M.	Luncheon	
1:30 - 2:45 P.M.	Open time for attending the Research Council's General Session on Research: "Research -- What Should Be the Goals and Priorities of the Research Council?"	Dr. Francis A. Ianni Columbia University Dr. James Gallagher U.S. Office of Education
FOURTH SESSION:	Dr. Joseph Mazur, presiding	
3:30 - 5:00 P.M.	Issues Related to Organizing an Evaluation System for Multi-Project Programs	Dr. Richard Jaeger Former Chief of Evaluation for Compensatory Education Programs, BESE Currently on leave from Stanford University

Friday, November 14th, 1969

FIFTH SESSION:	Dr. Malcolm Provus, presiding	
9:00 - 10:30 A.M.	Practical Implications of Operationalizing Selected Evaluation Models	Dr. James Jacobs Director of Research & Evaluation, Cincinnati Public Schools
10:30 - 12:30 P.M.	Planning the Training of Research Staff	
12:30 - 1:30 P.M.	Luncheon	
SIXTH SESSION:	Dr. Joseph Mazur, presiding	
1:30 - 3:00 P.M.	Planning Training Sessions for Research Directors	

APPENDIX C

Agenda of the Vail, Colorado,
Session for Research Directors

Vail, Colorado

RESEARCH DIRECTORS

"Systems Viewpoint in Project Development"

The Research Council of the Great City Schools

Research Directors Seminar
Vail Village Inn
Vail, Colorado
May 19-23, 1970

SYSTEMS VIEWPOINT IN PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

Wednesday, May 20, 1970

MORNING

First Session

Systems Approach in Dealing with R,D,D, and E Problems	Dr. Desmond Cook

Second Session

Basic Systems Concepts	Dr. John Skalski

AFTERNOON

Third Session

Systems Tools and Techniques, I	Dr. G. Trzebiatowski

Fourth Session

Systems Tools and Techniques, II	Dr. Cook and Dr. Trzebiatowski

Thursday, May 21, 1970

MORNING

Fifth Session

Research Director - A Systems Manager	Dr. Cook

Sixth Session

Systems Thinking in Single Project Planning and Development	Dr. Skalski

AFTERNOON

Seventh Session

Systems Thinking in Single Project Evaluation — Dr. Trzebiatowski

Eighth Session

Systems Thinking in Multi-Project Management

Friday, May 22, 1970

MORNING

Ninth Session

The Belmont Project From A Systems Viewpoint — Dr. Cook

Tenth Session

Performance Contracting - A Project of Systems Thinking — Dr. Rogers Barton

AFTERNOON

Eleventh Session

Implications of Using The Systems Approach, For The Research Director — Resource Panel

Twelvth Session

What Does It All Mean?
Where Do We Go From Here? — Directors Panel

SEMINAR PARTICIPANTS

Vail, Colorado

Dr. Larry Orcutt
Research & Development
Atlanta City Schools
224 Central Avenue
Atlanta, Georgia 30303
(404) 522-3381

Dr. Orlando F. Furno
Baltimore Public Schools
2521 N. Charles Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21218
(301) 467-4000 X463

Margaret M. Callahan
Office of Program Development
2893 Washington Street
Roxbury, Massachusetts 02119
(617) 445-6912

Mr. Claude Clapp
Buffalo Public Schools
712 City Hall
Buffalo, New York 14262
(716) 342-4660

Dr. Irving Brauer
Operations Analysis
Chicago Public Schools
228 North LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60601
(312) 641-3880

Dr. Joseph L. Mazur
Cleveland Public Schools
1380 East Sixth Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
(216) 696-2929

Dr. Arnold Ashburn
Research & Evaluation
Dallas Independent Schools
3700 Ross Avenue
Dallas, Texas
(214) 824-1620

Dr. Joseph Brzeinski, Director
Research Services
Denver Public Schools
414 - 14th Street
Denver, Colorado
(303) 266-2255 X497

Dr. Robert S. Lankton
Detroit Public Schools
5057 Woodward Avenue
Detroit, Michigan 48202
(313) 833-7900 X2301

Dr. Howard Bowman
Los Angeles City Schools
450 North Grand Avenue
Los Angeles, California 90012
(213) 625-8921

Miss Terry Bond
Memphis City Schools
2597 Avery Avenue
Memphis, Tennessee 38112
(901) 323-8311

Dr. Robert Brownlee
Milwaukee Public Schools
5224 West Vliet Street
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53208
(414) 476-3670

Dr. R. W. Faunce
Minneapolis Public Schools
807 N. E. Broadway
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55413
(612) 332-4284

Dr. Samuel D. McClelland (& Mrs.)
New York City Schools
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201
(212) 596-4045

Seminar Participants - Cont'd

Dr. William C. Theimer, Jr.
Philadelphia Public Schools
Parkway at 21st Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103
(215) 448-3573

Dr. Malcolm Provus
Pittsburgh Public Schools
341 South Bellefield Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213
(412) 682-1700

Dr. Gerald H. Moeller, Director
St. Louis City Schools
Division of Evaluation and Research
1517 S. Theresa Avenue
St. Louis, Missouri 63104
(314) 865-4550

Dr. William H. Vogler
San Diego City Schools
4100 Normal Street
San Diego, California
(714) 293-4681 X406

Dr. Harold L. Weeks
San Francisco School District
135 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, California 94102
(415) 863-4680

Dr. Mildred Cooper
Office of Budget Research & Legislation
Presidential Building
Room 1013
415 - 12th Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20004
(202) 347-6383

SEMINAR CONSULTANTS

Desmond L. Cook, Director
Gregory L. Trzebiatowski
John Skalski
Educational Program Management Center
College of Education
The Ohio State University
1945 North High Street
Columbus, Ohio 43210
(614) 293-4934

William Denton
School of Education
University of Wisconsin
415 West Gilman Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

Rogers Barton, Asst. Supt.
Planning & Research Division
Dallas Independent School District
3700 Ross Avenue, Room 45
Dallas, Texas 75204
(214) 824-1620

TITLE I CONSULTANTS

Marvin Dawson
Diane Schoenfelder
Cornelius Butler

NEA REPRESENTATIVE

Glen Robinson
NEA Research Division

COUNCIL STAFF

John L. Hayman, Jr., Research Director
Mary Lou Armiger, Research Associate
Jerry Calendine, Research Intern
Jack Stenner, Research Intern
Edward Whitney, Research Intern

APPENDIX D

Agenda of the Memphis
Session for Research Staff

Memphis, Tennessee — Staff

"The Affective Domain"

THE RESEARCH COUNCIL OF THE GREAT CITY SCHOOLS

Agenda for February Staff Training Session
Rivermont Holiday Inn
Memphis, Tennessee
February 25, 26, 27

Wednesday, February 25:

8:15	BREAKFAST -- Room to be Announced. Opening Remarks and Introduction of Resource Consultants	Dr. John Hayman
9:15	ISSUES IN MEASURING AFFECT: General Introduction to the Session Topic	Dr. David Orr
10:45	Break	
11:00	SMALL GROUP SESSION: Begin Outlining Specific Problems Experienced in School Systems	Participants and Staff
12:00	LUNCH	
1:00	GENERAL NATURE OF ATTITUDE FORMATION AND CHANGE: Emphasis on Problems Identified by Participants and on Areas of Concern in Public Education	Dr. Marvin Shaw
3:00	Break	
3:15	SMALL GROUP SESSION: Continue Outlining Problems	Participants and Staff
5:30	COCKTAIL PARTY	Participants and Staff

Thursday, February 26:

9:00	SPECIFIC ATTITUDE MEASURING INSTRUMENTS: Focus on the Likert Technique	Dr. Everett Rogers
10:30	Break	
10:45	GROUP SESSION: Practicum on Developing a Likert Scale	Dr. Marvin Shaw and Participants
12:00	LUNCH	
1:30	GENERAL ATTITUDE MEASURING INSTRUMENTS: Focus on the Semantic Differential	Dr. Bradley Greenberg
3:15	Break	
3:30	SMALL GROUP SESSION: Practicum on Developing a Semantic Differential Scale	Dr. Bradley Greenberg and Participants
7:00	PRESENTATIONS BY RESEARCH STAFF: Experiences in Developing and Using Affective Instruments	Miss Marion Kilbane Dr. John Temple Dr. Leo Weisbender

Friday, February 27:

9:00	MEASURES OF AFFINITY: The Sociometric Technique	Dr. Everett Rogers
10:45	Break	
11:00	SMALL GROUP SESSION: Determination of Ways the Sociometric Technique Might be Used in School Research	Participants and Staff
12:00	Lunch	
1:30	REPORT BACK FROM SMALL GROUPS; GENERAL SESSION AND FINAL WRAPUP	Participants and Staff
3:30	Session Ends	

RESEARCH TRAINING SEMINAR
PARTICIPANTS

Atlanta, Georgia	Miss Gaye Barnard Atlanta Public Schools Research and Development Division Atlanta, Georgia
Baltimore, Maryland	N. Craig Cutter Bureau of Instructional Research Baltimore City Public Schools 2521 N. Charles St. Baltimore, Maryland 21218
Boston, Massachusetts	Marian J. Ego Department of Educational Innovation and Measurement Boston Public Schools 45 Myrtle Street Boston, Massachusetts
	John LoConte Dept. of Title I Programs 2893 Washington Street Boston, Massachusetts 02119
Buffalo, New York	Dr. Douglas Houck Division of Curriculum Development and Evaluation Buffalo Public Schools City Hall Buffalo, New York
	Albert Thompson Division of Finance and Research Buffalo Public Schools City Hall Buffalo, New York
Cleveland, Ohio	Mrs. Hallie Francies Cleveland Board of Education 1380 East 6th Street Cleveland, Ohio 44114

Cleveland, Ohio	Miss Marian Kilbane Division of Research Cleveland Public Schools 1380 East 6th Street Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Dallas, Texas	Dr. Arnold Ashburn, Consultant Research & Evaluation Dallas Independent Schools 3700 Ross Avenue Dallas, Texas
Denver, Colorado	John Temple Office of Planning, Research, & Budgeting 414 - 14th Street Denver, Colorado 80202
Detroit, Michigan	George W. Jacobs Schools Center - Room 862 5057 Woodward Avenue Detroit, Michigan 48202
Los Angeles, California	Dr. Leo Weisbender Measurement & Evaluation (Los Angeles City Schools) 8810 Emerson Avenue, Room 7 Los Angeles, California 90045
Memphis, Tennessee	Mrs. Virginia W. Blanton 2597 Avery Board of Education Memphis, Tennessee 38112
	Miss Terry Bond 2597 Avery Board of Education Memphis, Tennessee 38112
	Miss Kathy M. Eggers Memphis Community Learning Laboratory 370 S. Orleans Memphis, Tennessee

Milwaukee, Wisconsin	Dr. Gary D. Peterson Milwaukee Public Schools 5225 West Vliet Street Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53208
Minneapolis, Minnesota	R.W. Faunce Minneapolis Public Schools 807 N.E. Broadway Minneapolis, Minnesota 55413
	Mrs. Rebecca Howard Minneapolis Public Schools 807 N.E. Broadway Minneapolis, Minnesota 55413
New York, New York	Mr. Howard S. Tilis Bureau of Educational Research 110 Livingston Street Brooklyn, New York
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	Dr. Robert G. Reiter Office of Research & Evaluation School District of Philadelphia 21st Street at Parkway Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania	Glenn E. Queer Research Associate Pittsburgh Board of Public Education Office of Research 249 North Craig Street Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
St. Louis, Missouri	H. Tupper Drane Division of Evaluation & Research St. Louis Public Schools 1517 Theresa Street St. Louis, Missouri
San Diego, California	Mr. Stuart Macnofsky Testing Services San Diego City Schools 4100 Normal Street San Diego, California

San Francisco, California

Mrs. Mary Jane Fernandez
ESEA Compensatory Resource Center
844 Folsom Street
San Francisco, California

Washington, D.C.

Mrs. Beulah G. Glenn
Department of Research & Evaluation
D.C. Public School System
415 - 12th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004

Mrs. Josefina M. Ordonez
Department of Research & Evaluation
(D.C. Public Schools
415 - 12th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004

Research Council Consultants:

Dr. Bradley Greenberg
511 S. Kedzie
Michigan State University
E. Lansing, Michigan 48823

Dr. David B. Orr
Scientific Educational Systems, Inc.
#607, 910 17th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Dr. Everett Rogers
Department of Communication
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

Dr. Marvin Shaw
Department of Psychology
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32601

Research Council Staff:

Dr. John Hayman, Jr.
Research Director
Research Council of the Great City Schools
1819 "H" Street, N.W.
Suite #850
Washington, D.C. 20006

Miss Mary Lou Armiger
Research Associate
Research Council of the Great City Schools
1819 "H" Street, N.W.
Suite #850
Washington, D.C. 20006

Mr. Gerry Calendine
Research Intern
Research Council of the Great City Schools
1819 "H" Street, N.W.
Suite #850
Washington, D.C. 20006

Mr. Jack Stenner
Research Intern
Research Council of the Great City Schools
1819 "H" Street, N.W.
Suite #850
Washington, D.C. 20006

Mr. Edward Whitney
Research Intern
Research Council of the Great City Schools
1819 "H" Street, N.W.
Suite #850
Washington, D.C. 20006

Memo of Suggestions
Voiced at the Final Memphis Session

1. Research Council might serve as a clearinghouse through which member school districts could share the following:
    a. Locally devised measurement instruments, with examples of their specific application;
    b. Computer programs, described via one-page abstracts;
    c. Optical Scanning ("Digitek") forms designed for specific uses in research and evaluation;
    d. Examples of good format for final reports to various audiences, such as a brief report plus separate technical supplement, a concise and separately bound "executive summary," and audio-visual aids for oral briefing of administrators.
2. Research Council might seek to orient our superintendents and associate superintendents to the value, proper role, and appropriate use of research.

APPENDIX E

Training Institute for
Research and Evaluation Personnel
of the Great City Schools

September 20-23, 1970

Report of Training Institute for Research and Evaluation Personnel of the Great City Schools

Introduction and Background

During the dates of September 21-23, 1970, Teaching Research conducted a training institute, in Monmouth, Oregon, for research and evaluation personnel of the twenty-one cooperating School Districts of The Council of the Great City Schools.

Preliminary planning and negotiations for the training institute had been negotiated with Dr. John L. Hayman, Jr., Director of Research of The Council of the Great City Schools during the spring of 1970. (See Attachment A) It was agreed that a three day institute would be held during late September, 1970, in Oregon for research and evaluation personnel of the Great City Schools Research Departments to be organized around the four areas of proposal writing, instructional systems, measurement and evaluation.

It was further agreed that the following details would be included in the institute:

1. A pre-test to assess the competence level of each participant before instruction.
2. Independent learning activities, adjusted to each individual's needs, to the extent possible.
3. A post-test to measure growth.
4. Certification as to what each participant was able to do in relation to his selected area of study.
5. An evaluation of the effectiveness of the institute, copies of which would be sent to each Research Director.

Participants in the institute numbered thirty-two. The Council of the Great City Schools assumed the responsibility for their selection and notification. Arrangements for transportation and housing were handled by Teaching Research. All participants were met at the Portland International Airport and motored 50 miles south to Salem where they were lodged at the Marion Motor Hotel. Participants were assigned to cars by groups and driven 15 miles to the Oregon College of Education campus in Monmouth each day. The list of participants is included as Attachment B.

Objectives

The purpose of the institute was to bring research and evaluation personnel of the Great Cities research departments together to:

1. Provide instruction in the areas of measurement, evaluation, instructional systems, and proposal writing.
2. Provide an environmental conducive to independent learning activities and adjusted to each individual's needs; and
3. Provide and assessment of the competence level of each participant in relation to his area of study.

In addition to the above, terminal behaviors expected from each of the four areas of instruction were defined and negotiated with each participant and his instructor (See Attachment C for detailed objectives in each area).

Program

An outlined summary of the institute schedule has been included as Attachment D. In general, the instructional sequence minimized passive mass-reception and maximized active individual and small group involvement. The institute was initiated Monday, September 21, 1970 at 8:30 p.m., with an orientation during which participants and staff were introduced and specific goals and procedure of the institute were clarified.

The total group was then divided into four subject groups. Participants were given the choice of joining any one of the following: evaluation, instructional systems, measurement or proposal writing. The group assembled in separate areas and spent the remainder of the

morning being pre-tested and negotiating individualized performance goals for each member. The latter was accomplished by the instructor of each group sitting with each member of his group to (1) review the results of that persons post-test, (2) clarify for the member, any questions he might have concerning the behavioral objectives established for that subject group, (3) identify specific interests of that member in the area, and (4) negotiate a set of behavioral objectives with that member which took into consideration the members pre-knowledge of the area, his expressed interests in the area and reasonable limits of departure from the goals established for the institute.

From these negotiations, individualized learning experiences were then planned for the remainder of the institute time period. With the exception of the final total group meeting during the late afternoon of the last day of the institute, the institute was devoted to independent learning activities.

Two "extra" learning activities were also planned and carried out during the institute. Noon luncheons were scheduled in a convenient local restaurant with provisions for all other staff members of Teaching Research not involved in the institute (approximately thirty) being present.

Several lasting acquaintances between participants and Teaching Research personnel have emerged from these informal interactions with resulting benefits to both The Council of the Great City Schools and Teaching Research.

The second extra activity involved the transportation of institute participants and staff to the Oregon Coast on the afternoon of the second day to relax and enjoy the fall beauty of the rugged coast and

to partake of a variety of excellent seafood. Although no learning experiences directly related to the goals of the institute were planned as a part of the coast visit, obvious indirect benefits did result as noted in subsequent expressions of pleasure and satisfaction from participants and a generally more relaxed attitude on their part during the remainder of the institute.

Evaluation

The principal evalaution of this institute was in the form of post-tests within each subject group. Since each individual participant negotiated his own specific set of behavior objectives, a formalized institute post-test was not appropriate. Instead, each subject area instructor carried out post-testing to fit the particular needs of his participants. With the exception of one member who had to leave on the second day of the institute and two other members who were from the Council's Central Office who had continuous interruptions which prevented their maintaining instructional continuity, each participant was judged as having achieved at least the minimal level of performance he had established for himself.

In addition to the above, the final debriefing of all participants was conducted during the final hour of the institute. The group was asked to respond to the following three questions:

1. What, would have improved the institute in helping you to accomplish your learning goals?
2. What "warm blanket" treatment was not good?
3. Did you accomplish what you expected from the institute?

Responses to these questions are summarized as follows:

Item 1:

—It would have been better if institute instructional materials could have been distributed to participants before coming.

—More instructured interaction time among participants would have been beneficial.

—Pre-testing of participants via mail prior to the institute would have given the institute staff a better opportunity of preparing for individualizing instruction.

—More time to sit down individually with institute staff would have helped.

Item 2:

—"My kidneys are killing me from riding in that bus to the coast."

—"It would have been better to stay in Monmouth rather than Salem and save the drive."

—"We should have gone to the coast sooner."

Item 3:

—"My expectations were met."

—"The time was too limited, it should have been a week."

—Small group discussion of common problems was excellent but should have been increased.

—Many expressed strong interest in having a second institute scheduled to follow-on as soon as possible.

Recommendations

The following recommendations were compiled from the debriefing remarks, general conversations with participants and reactions from the staff:

1. Pre-institute assessment of participants relative to the objectives of the institute should be accomplished. Not only would this afford institute planners a clearer understanding of the participants and how they differed, it would allow more realistic planning for individualization as well as the gathering of special learning resources which might be useful for participants.

2. Instructional experiences should be prepared such that they are approached from the point of view of their relevance to large city school districts. Rather than utilize abstract examples or situations which are very distant from large city school problems in the instructional materials, direct translation to current problems being encountered in the urban school districts should be prepared. (Of course, the latter cannot be accomplished without considerable lead-time for preparation.)

3. The listing of institute goal statements and objectives along with the basic reference materials to be used, should be mailed to each participant at least two weeks before the start of the institute. By introducing participants to the general concerns of the institute and informing them about available resources, participants could arrive with more realistic goal expectations and a more uniform entry information level.

4. All individualized learning materials, e.g., slide-tapes, films, etc., should be made available early in the institute so that participants would have the advantage of being introduced to the institute's philosophy and orientation to specific issues.

5. A cluster of rooms in the hotel in which participants are lodged should be obtained to provide easy group gathering during evening hours to permit discussion of pertinent topics as to facilitate various social

activities which allow discussion of common problems.

6. Small group discussions of relevant topics, using participants as presenters, should be utilized and scheduled very early in the institute. The participant group is usually a powerful one in that they have first hand knowledge of a variety of problems in their jobs. Many of the solutions to problems devised by these people are often excellent and can prove to be a useful mechanism to involve the group and extend into the institute subject area.

Attachment A

May 29, 1970

Dr. John Hayman
Director of Research
Research Council of the
Great Cities Schools
1818 H. Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Dear Dr. Hayman:

It is my understanding, as reported to me by Jack Edling, that the Great Cities Research Council wishes Teaching Research to organize and conduct a training session for research personnel of the Great Cities research departments. The institute will be held in Oregon in late September over a three day time period.

We propose that the institute be held during the dates September 21-23, with participants arriving on Sunday, September 20 and departing early Thursday, September 24. The site would be on the Oregon coast, either at Salishan Lodge or The Inn at Spanish Head.

The institute will be organized around the four areas of proposal writing, instructional systems, measurement, and evaluation. Participants will be asked to choose in which area they would desire to receive instruction. To assist prospective participants in making a choice, I have enclosed a statement that defines the outcome behaviors expected of learners in each area. Also attached is a simple form to be completed and returned to Teaching Research which will tell us how many to expect in each area. I presume that you will distribute these materials to the Great Cities Research Directors.

The following details will be included in the institute:

1. A pre-test to assess the competence level of each participant before instruction.

2. Independent learning activities, adjusted to each individual's needs, to the extent possible.

3. A post-test to measure growth.

4. Certification as to what each participant is able to do in relation to his selection area of study. (If a participant completes his first area of study before the institute concludes, he may begin a second topic of study.)

5. An evaluation of the effectiveness of the institute, copies of which will be sent to each Research Director.

The costs involved in organizing and conducting the institute are as follows: (these are based on 30 participants and four staff members for a three day institute)

Instructional staff, $450/staff member x 4		$ 1,800*
Support services and planning time, $375/staff member x 4		1,500
Travel, 30RT - Portland to Salishan		180
Student drivers, 150 hrs. @ $2.00/hr.		300
Participant instructional materials $15 x 30		450
	Subtotal	$ 4,230
Indirect costs - for contract processing, other administrative overhead, equipment and facilities @ 8% x $4,230		338
*Employee benefits are included in this figure	TOTAL	$ 4,568

Each additional participant beyond 30 should be budgeted for $100 which includes in-state travel to institute site, instruction, and materials.

In addition to the above costs, you of course will have to budget for individual travel to Portland and per diem. As soon as we have confirmation of the number attending we will make lodging reservations and inform you of details such as room and food costs.

I hope you will find it convenient to come to Teaching Research in the near future to work with us in preparing a proposal aimed at continuing the training of research personnel of the Great Cities Schools. We are considerably enthused about such a possibility and look forward to working with you.

Jack Edling asked me to express his appreciation for the opportunity of meeting in Denver with the Research Council of the Great Cities Schools, to clarify the details of this agreement. I am writing this letter to indicate that this is a firm contractual arrangement between the Great Cities Research Council and Teaching Research.

Sincerely yours,

Dale G. Hamreus
Associate Director

DGH:ss
cc: Dr. Jack V. Edling
Enclosures

Attached are four areas related to research in which training will be offered in the fall. After reviewing each behavioral description, complete the form below and return to:

Dr. John Hayman
Director of Research
Research Council of the
Great Cities Schools
1819 H. Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Name_____

Position_____

Institution_____ City_____ State_____

Highest degree attained_____

Major area of preparation_____

Indicate your preference of areas in which you desire to receive training by placing 1 in front of your first choice and 2 in front of your second choice.

_____Proposal Writing

_____Instructional Systems

_____Measurement

_____Evaluation

Proposal Writing - After completing the package on proposal writing, the learner will:

1. identify major componenets of a proposal, their function and criteria for determining their adequacy by demonstrating from recall, an ordered set of proposal components.

2. detect and prescribe a remedy for certain typical weaknesses in proposals by identifying weaknesses in examples and indicating changes required to reach acceptable standards.

3. construct a sound proposal outline in a problem area of personal interest and write a proposal which meets funding standards as determined by experienced proposal viewers from Teaching Research who are currently reviewing proposals for the U.S. Office of Education.

Instructional Systems - After completing the package on instructional systems, the learner will:

1. identify what is meant by the systems approach to instruction by defining systems and management elements, detailing design and analysis strategies and specifying development and assessment procedures.

2. specify instructional sequences by demonstrating a method of objective analysis that guides the designer in determining what enabling objectives are prerequisite to terminal objectives and the order in which each objective should be taught.

3. specify instructional conditions by identifying a series of guidelines that detail learner characteristics, the instructional context, instructional stimuli, learner responses, and feedback routes.

4. define the relationship between research and the instructional development by identifying distinguishing characteristics.

Measurement - After completing the package on measurement, the learner will:

1. derive, in logical fashion, measurable characteristics from educational objectives having a range from concreteness to abstractness.

2. identify the scale (i.e., nominal, ordinal, interval, or ratio) represented in any measuring instrument considered for use and express in writing the limitations each scale imposes on the meaning of the obtained data.

3. define, on a matching basis, key terms involved with reliability and validity; express examples of each; and specify ways of reducing error in measurement.

4. define key concepts which tend to reduce issues of reliability and validity in measurement and cite independent examples of each.

5. reflect familiarity with various classes of measures by discussing issues involved in the use of specific instruments.

6. construct measuring instruments that are valid for the purpose of measuring stated instructional objectives.

Evaluation - After completing the package on evaluation, the learner will:

1. establish for himself the purpose for evaluation by answering questions such as "who needs what information? When is the information needed? What classes of decisions are to be made?"

2. define the context within which evaluation is to be conducted which includes identification of variables to be evaluated, clarification of the role and use of objectives and objective specifications in identifying value parameters, and procedures for the identification of criteria in setting standards for evaluation.

3. cope with evaluation decisions from the point of view of a program director which includes an understanding of several leading evaluation models, strategies for evaluation design and need assessment strategies.

4. identify the principle features of the tools of evaluation which include: (1) information collection procedures (sources of needed information, form in which information will be needed, decision criteria for determining collection procedures, sampling): (2) instrumentation (standardized tests, judgmental responses, questionnaires, interviews, observational methods, unobtrusive measures, instrument credibility); (3) information processing (data types, purpose of analysis, levels of measurement, data organization, statistical treatments, displaying results); and (4) information distribution (audience characteristics, single or multiple distribution channels, purpose of distribution).

Attachment B

Great Cities' Institute
Teaching Research
September 20-23, 1970

NAME	TOWN & STATE
Mary Lou Armiger	Washington, D.C.
Phillip Bolger	New York, New York
Terry Bond	Memphis, Tennessee
Kenneth Bourguignon	Atlanta, Georgia
Jerry Calendine	Washington, D.C.
James Carpenter	Chicago, Illinois
John LoConte	Boston, Massachusetts
N. Graig Cutter	Baltimore Maryland
William Denton	Washington, D.C.
Arthur Draper	St. Louis, Missouri
Roger Fish	Washington, D.C.
Arthur Flater	Milwaukee, Wisconsin
Orlandon F. Furno	Baltimore, Maryland
John Hayman, Jr.	Washington, D.C.
Wilford Howard	Denver, Colorado
Larry Johnson	Minneapolis, Minnesota
Marcella Kirk	Chicago, Illinois
Michael La Bay	San Diego, California
John Lindsey	Detroit, Michigan
Richard McMenemy	Portland, Oregon
Joan O'Malley	Chicago, Illinois
Sam Mason	Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

NAME	TOWN & STATE
Vincent Piraino	Milwaukee, Wisconsin
John L. Posa	Los Angeles, California
Glenn Queer	Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Jack Stenner	Washington, D.C.
Derek B. Taylor	Cleveland, Ohio
Albert Thompson	Buffalo, New York
Melvin Tidyman	San Francisco, California
Lavolia Vails	Washington, D.C.
James H. Van Orden	Washington, D.C.
Bill Webster	Dallas, Texas

Attachment C

Great Cities Institute
Teaching Research
Monmouth, Oregon
September 21-23, 1970

Introduction: The Great Cities Institute has brought research personnel of the Great Cities research departments together to:

1. Provide instruction in the areas of measurement, evaluation, instructional systems and proposal writing;

2. Provide an environment conducive to independent learning activities and adjusted to each individual's needs; and

3. Provide an assessment of the competence level of each participant in relation to his area of study.

Each participant, at his own choice, will receive instruction in one of the following four areas. Expected outcome behaviors are defined but will be subject to modification for any individual as a result of negotiated changes with his subject area instructor.

1. Measurement (Dr. James Beaird). After completing the package on measurement, the learner will:

   a. derive, in logical fashion, measurable characteristics from educational objectives having a range from concreteness to abstractness.

   b. identify the scale (i.e., nominal, ordinal, interval, or ratio) represented in any measuring instrument considered for use and express in writing the limitations each scale imposes on the meaning of the obtained data.

   c. define, on a matching basis, key terms involved with reliability and validity; express examples of each; and specify ways of reducing error in measurement.

   d. define key concepts which tend to reduce issues of reliability and validity in measurement and cite independent examples of each.

   e. reflect familiarity with various classes of measures by discussing issues involved in the use of specific instruments.

   f. construct measuring instruments that are valid for the purpose of measuring stated instructional objectives.

2. Evaluation (Dr. Frank Nelson). Upon completion of three days study in evaluation, a participant in the Great Cities Institute will be able to create an evaluation design for a specified project which will provide both adaptive and descriptive information congruent with established (or given) value standards.

3. Instructional Systems (Dr. Floyd Urbach). After completing the package on instructional systems, the learner will:

   a. identify what is meant by the systems approach to instruction by defining systems and management elements, detailing design and analysis strategies and specifying development and assessment procedures.

   b. specify instructional sequences by demonstrating a method of objective analysis that guides the designer in determining what enabling objectives are prerequisite to terminal objectives and the order in which each objective should be taught.

   c. specify instructional conditions by identifying a series of guidelines that detail learner characteristics, the instructional context, instructional stimuli, learner responses, and feedback routes.

4. Proposal Writing (Mrs. Lee Green).

   Specific Knowledges to be acquired:
   a. To be able to recall and demonstrate understanding of the function of major components of a research proposal.

   b. To demonstrate ability to locate information on funding sources.

   Analysis skills to be developed:
   c. To be able to identify weaknesses and strengths in component parts of a research proposal.

   Synthesis skills to be developed:
   d. To improve and correct component parts of a research proposal by rewriting identified areas of weakness.

   Synthesis and Evaluative skills to be developed:
   e. To create an outline for an adequate proposal in the student's area of particular interest.

   f. To evaluate a research proposal.

Daily trainsportation between the Marion Motor Hotel and Teaching Research will be provided participants. Pick-up will be at 8 a.m. at the covered guest entrance of the Hotel. Departure from Teaching Research will be 5:00 p.m.

Attachment D

INSTITUTE SCHEDULE

Monday - September 21

8:00 a.m.	Depart for Teaching Research	
8:30 a.m.	Introductions and Orientation	Dale Hamreus
9:00 a.m.	Break into subject groups:	
	Measurement	Dr. Jim Beaird
	Evaluation	Dr. Frank Nelson
	Instructional Systems	Dr. Floyd Urbach
	Proposal Writing	Mrs. Lee Green
	Pre-testing	
	Each participant negotiates a specific set of outcome goals to be achieved during institute.	

(Coffee in TRAC each morning and afternoon as desired.)

12 noon	Lunch: Blue Garden (walk) Interaction with other available members of Teaching Research
1:30 p.m.	Independent learning activities
5:00 p.m.	Depart for Marion Motor Hotel

Tuesday - September 22

8:00 a.m.	Depart for Teaching Research
8:30 a.m.	Independent Learning Activity
12 noon	Lunch: Blue Garden
1:30 p.m.	Independent Learning Activity
3:30 p.m.	Depart for Oregon Coast and Salishan Lodge for dinner
8:00 p.m.(approximate)	Depart for Marion Motor Hotel

Wednesday - September 23

8:00 a.m.	Depart for Teaching Research
8:30 a.m.	Independent Learning Activity
12 noon	Lunch: Blue Garden
1:30 p.m.	Independent Learning Activity
3:00 p.m.	Post-test and Debrief
4:00 p.m.	Group Meeting: 5 minute report from each group summarizing accomplishments
5:00 p.m.	Departure for Marion Motor Hotel

APPENDIX F

Sample of Reactions to Programs

ATLANTA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

ADMINISTRATION BUILDING 224 CENTRAL AVE., S.W. ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303

DIVISION OF
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

October 19, 1970

Dr. John Hayman
The Research Council of the
Great Cities Schools
1819 H Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20006

Dear Dr. Hayman:

As one of the participants in the Great City Schools Teaching Research Workshop held at Monmouth, Oregon, I believe this letter of appreciation is in order.

It has now been three weeks since I have returned to Atlanta and it seems that every day I have been able to make use of something I brought back from the workshop. I feel this indicates a high degree of relevancy and utility in the materials presented. Although the workshop at Monmouth was only the first one I have attended, if it was typical of the quality of work being done by the Research Council of the Great City Schools, I heartily endorse anything you may plan for the future and look forward to being in attendance if at all possible.

Yours Truly,

Kenneth Bourguinon

Kenneth Bourguinon
Research Assistant

cc: Dr. Alvin G. Skelly

KB/gl

SAINT LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

DIVISION OF EVALUATION AND RESEARCH

March 4, 1970

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Dr. Robert G. Reiter
Division of Research and Evaluation
Philadelphia Public Schools
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Dear Dr. Reiter:

I am very happy to have had the opportunity to meet you at the recent seminar in Memphis sponsored by the Research Council of the Great Cities Schools. I am equally glad that I was in the small group discussion with you in which you explained the forced choice socio-metric instrument that you have developed for use in Philadelphia. Although I do not have a copy of the instrument, I was able to take adequate notes to explain it to other members of our division.

In the last session of the seminar, on Friday afternoon, you may recall that Mr. Hayman described a system of key indicators that is being developed for use in Philadelphia. He mentioned that thirty-eight variables were considered originally but that the list had been reduced to twenty different variables, some of which would be gathered monthly and some annually. We have been studying preparatory to development a similar system to be used with the St. Louis Public Schools. We are currently at the stage of trying to identify variables that will be adequately informative to justify the cost of inclusion in the information system. Perhaps you could share some of your findings in this respect with us. Could you send us a list and description of the variables that you plan to include in your system, as well as those that have been set aside. If you have any statistical findings, technical memoranda, or published materials on this project, we would be very interested in studying them.

It was wonderful to have met you at the seminar in Memphis. I will be looking forward to meeting you again at some future date.

Sincerely yours,

H. TUPPER DRAKE
Administrative Assistant

HTD/lb

59

OCT 2 6 REC'D

DENVER PUBLIC SCHOOLS
414 FOURTEENTH STREET / DENVER, CO 80202
HOWARD L. JOHNSON, *Superintendent*

OFFICE OF PLANNING, RESEARCH, AND BUDGETING
JOSEPH E. BRZEZINSKI, *Executive Director*

October 22, 1970

Dr. Alvin G. Skelly, Executive
Vice President
The Research Council of the
Great Cities Schools
1819 H. Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Dear Dr. Skelly:

The Great Cities Research Council is to be commended for their efforts in promoting sound educational research practices.

The personnel of the Denver Public Schools Research staff who have been fortunate enough to attend the Great Cities Research Conferences have returned inspired and singing the praises of Dr. John Hayman and his staff. Rarely does one find the opportunity for intellectual and social interchanges between school representatives on a national level. The activities of the Council have made this possible.

The workshop at Monmouth, Oregon demonstrated the organizational expertise of the Council staff. Arrangements were exacting, activities timely, and relevant. The enthusiastic leadership of the conference was contagious, affecting all participants.

Today we are witnessing a greater selectivity on the part of funding agencies. An undertaking must be educationally sound, have practical value, and be capable of effecting desirable change. The activities of the Great Cities Council certainly qualifies in all these areas.

If educational practices and procedures are to change it will be through projects such as the Great Cities Research Council. School district representatives from across the nation must be brought together to share knowledge, to exchange ideas, and to develop some common dialogue relating to educational needs in large urban areas.

The Planning, Research, and Budgeting staff of the Denver Public Schools supports the objectives and activities of the Great Cities Council and extends to Dr. John Hayman a sincere vote of confidence for a job well done.

Sincerely,

Will Howard

Will Howard, Supervisor
Office of Planning, Research,
and Budgeting

WH:cd

cc: Dr. John Hayman

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH
110 LIVINGSTON STREET
BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11201

SAMUEL D. McCLELLAND
ACTING DIRECTOR

GEORGE FORLANO
ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATIVE DIRECTOR

10/9/1970

Dr. John Hayman
The Research Council of the
Great Cities Schools
1819 H. Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Dear Dr. Hayman:

Congratulations upon the excellent job you and your staff did in arranging for the meeting in Monmouth,Oregon. I feel that such effort would be ignored ungraciously were I not to send this note expressing my gratitude.

Four years ago I attended the conference at Northwestern; I could not help but notice the vast improvement that has taken place during the intervening years. This is not to demean the original efforts made for Northwestern but merely to note an obvious trend. It is genuinely encouraging to those of us who "labor in the vineyards" of urban educational research to see the Council expanding in both numbers of representatives and participating cities. Few outside research can realize the positive results accruing from such a phenomenon. The benefits are both personal and professional. There is much one takes away from these meetings in the way of motivation and ideas, not to mention the catharsis provided by the experience itself.

I was most favorably impressed with the personal and professional efforts of our hosts in Oregon. Their relationships with us were characterized by consideration, courtesy and understanding. After the usual abrasive social relationships we too frequently experience in the city, this was a welcome change. The panel I attended on Systems Approaches clearly evidenced excellent preparation, enthusiastic implementation and challenging material.

It is the general opinion of the three research men who have attended the conferences representing New York City (Dr. Turner, Mr. Tilis and myself) that they were always worthwhile experiences. I cite this evidence lest anyone construe this letter as a biased sample. We all look forward to another meeting next year.

It is my sincere wish that you and your staff be given the recognition for this national achievement. I think we have a great idea implemented and look forward to many positive benefits for the field of educational research. Things are begining to jell. Good luck ; continue your efforts to bring this to fruition and , once again, thanks.

Sincerely yours,

Phil Bolger

Dr. Philip A. Bolger
Research Associate
N.Y.C. Bureau of Ed. Research
Room 718

Copy: Dr. A.G. Skelly
Dr. S.D.McClelland

PORTLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS
631 Northeast Clackamas Street / Portland, Oregon 97208
Phone (503) 234-3392
EVALUATION DEPARTMENT

Victor W. Doherty
Assistant Superintendent

Clifford W. Williams
Director

October 14, 1970

Dr. John Hayman
The Research Council of the
Great Cities Schools
1819 H. Street N.W.
Washington, C.C. 20006

Dear John:

I'd like to belatedly express my appreciation and support for the recent meeting we had at Monmouth, Oregon.

Professional growth is a difficult thing to quantify, but I believe all the participants would agree that a great deal of growth did occur; partly through the highly individualized program provided by Oregon College of Education and partly through the chance to exchange ideas and strategies for the solution of problems with the other confreres.

Needless to say, I hope the possibilities for future meetings will receive serious consideration.

Yours truly,

Richard A. McMenemy
Evaluation Specialist

RAM:ds

cc: Dr. Alvin G. Skelly
Executive Vice President

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS
EDUCATION CENTER
PARK AND EL CAJON BOULEVARDS
SAN DIEGO 3, CALIFORNIA

STUDENT SERVICES DIVISION

October 14, 1970

Dr. John Hayman
The Research Council of the
Great Cities Schools
1819 H. Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Dear Dr. Hayman:

Will Howard of the Denver Public Schools has asked me to relate to you my impressions of the September workshop in Monmouth, Oregon. Since we have discussed the evaluation section during your visit to San Diego this month I can only reiterate my feeling that the benefits derived from the three days at Monmouth were well-worth the time spent. The sharing of ideas among evaluators and the expertise provided by the Teaching Research staff combined to make a pleasant and productive experience. Speaking for my school district, it is our opinion that such a project is worthy of continued support.

Sincerely,

Michael J. LaBay

Michael J. LaBay
Program Evaluator
San Diego City Schools

MJB:vs

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
BOARD OF EDUCATION
21ST STREET SOUTH OF THE PARKWAY
19103

MARK R. SHEDD
SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

WILLIAM C. THEIMER, JR.
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

JOHN B. PEPER
DIRECTOR
448-3785

EDWARD K. BROWN
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR
448-3741

March 17, 1970

Mr. H. Tupper Drane
Division of Evaluation and Research
Saint Louis Public Schools
1517 S. Theresa Avenue
Saint Louis, Missouri 63104

Dear Mr. Drane:

I am enclosing three items which I hope will be of some help as you consider the expansion of your information system:

(1) A list of the 20 key indicators;

(2) Definitions of some terms used in that list;

(3) A list of 13 optional indicators.

Because of financial restrictions, the key indicator program has been only partly implemented to this date. Although we are hoping for gradually increasing implementation from year to year, our experience in using the indicators has been so limited that we cannot announce any conclusions at this time. However, I can say that we have not found any reason yet to doubt the desirability of full implementation.

I share your enthusiasm about the Memphis seminar and have told Dr. Hayman so. Among the factors I found especially exciting are (1) the personal associations, (2) seeing that most of us are in the midst of a developmental process rather than loaded with conclusions, and (3) the subsequent opportunities such as this to share ideas.

I hope the enclosures will be useful to you, and that we may meet again. I'll be interested to hear about your progress with key indicators.

Sincerely yours,

Bob Reiter

Robert G. Reiter
Test Specialist
Office of Research and Evaluation

RGR:dmw

Enclosure

cc: Dr. John L. Hayman, Jr.
Dr. William C. Theimer, Jr.
Dr. John B. Peper
Mr. Daniel R. Fasciono

An Equal Opportunity Employer

Minneapolis Public Schools

SPECIAL SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 1

SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

807 Northeast Broadway Minneapolis, Minnesota 55413

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND FEDERAL PROGRAMS
(612) 332-5371
DONALD D. BEVIS, *Assistant Superintendent*

RESEARCH DIVISION (612) 336-1738
RICHARD W. FAUNCE, *Consultant*
PLANNING AND
DEVELOPMENT DIVISION (612) 332-5371
LAWRENCE P. MOON, *Director*
MARY C. KASBOHM, *Assistant Director*

October 12, 1970

Dr. John Hayman
The Research Council of the
Great Cities Schools
1819 H Street N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20006

Dear Dr. Hayman:

This brief letter is being sent to give you some feedback regarding the recent workshop at Monmouth, Oregon, sponsored by the Council of the Great Cities Schools. The materials available through the Teaching Research Division of the Oregon State System of Higher Education was very relevant to my needs. One of the most beneficial aspects was an increased knowledge of various educational evaluation systems. Hopefully, this knowledge will result in the output of more productive research from this writer.

Another benefit of the workshop was the contacts made with participants from other cities. We all agreed the sharing of information and ideas was stimulating and should be continued. It appeared that all participants thought much could be gained by additional workshops in this area, possibly concentrating more on specific problem solving by groups and increased sharing of information between cities.

I believe use of additional funds for this purpose would be a good investment.

Sincerely,

Lary Johnson

Lary Johnson
Research Associate

LJ:dm
cc: Dr. Alvin G. Skelly
Dr. R. W. Faunce

THE BOARD OF PUBLIC EDUCATION

PITTSBURGH, PA. 15213

ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
BELLEFIELD AND FORBES AVENUES

March 10, 1970

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Dr. John L. Hayman
Research Director
Research Council of the
Great City Schools
1819 H Street, N. W.,
Washington, D. C. 20006

Dear Dr. Hayman:

The following is a brief feedback note concerning the Memphis training session.

I feel the greatest impact of the session was a positive affective shift toward Measurement in the Affective Domain. The Thursday session and particularly the documentations provided by Dr. Rogers will contribute most to the behavioralization of this shift. Presentations of actual affective evaluation examples were of more practical value than the historical and/or theoretical accounts of the measurements which were given.

The Research Council can certainly strengthen local research and evaluation efforts by maximizing interaction between the Great City Schools and also by continuing to update and strengthen staff competencies through training sessions which will become better and more specific with experience. The Memphis session was certainly a step in the right direction.

Sincerely yours,

Glenn E. Queer

Glenn E. Queer
Field Research Associate

GEQ/jms